UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,510	12/26/2000	Fredrick L. Pittroff	018280-000700US	4105

20350 7590 07/28/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
ALPERT, JAMES M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3693	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/748,510	PITTROFF, FREDRICK L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James Alpert	3693	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *11,14 and 17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *11,14 and 17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/16/2006 has been entered.

Status of Claims

In the previous final Office Action, Claims 11 & 13 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over Jaros et al, U.S. Patent #6877656 in view of Warwick et al, U.S. Patent #5266781. Claim 14 was rejected as being unpatentable over Jaros in view of Warwick, and further in view of Chari et al, U.S. Patent #6134614.

In applicant's submission of 05/16/2006, Claim 11 is currently amended. Claim 14 is previously presented. Claims 1-10, 12-13,15-16 are cancelled. Claim 17 is new, so Claims 11,14,17 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/16/2006 have been fully considered. The examiner would initially point out that one of the cited passage to which Applicants object, (Col. 5, line 64 – Col. 6, line 4), is actually from the Jaros reference and not the Warwick rerference. That passage is cited for the proposition that somehow, though perhaps not expressly disclosed, the system in Jaros will route issuance requests based

on collaboration among the remote dispensers, which necessarily implies that location and type of card are part of this decisioning.

Secondly, the examiner has found a better expression of the queuing functionality disclosed by Applicant, in a new reference, Lenz et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication #20050236473. Thus, Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11,14,17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of section 103 of Title 35 of the United States Code, is not included in this action, but can be found in a prior Office action. Claims 11,17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaros in view of Lenz.

With regard to Claim 11, Jaros teaches a method comprising:

generating a request in a client process to produce an identification card wherein said request includes information regarding a type of card to be produced;
(Col. 9, lines 25-39, describing the request by the user for a card, secured or otherwise, and Figure #2, items 206,202, which accepts requests and can transmits information a central server)

transmitting said request from said client process to the enterprise server through an enterprise network to manage the production of said identification card;
(Figure #1, item 102, which is the central decisioning system, which manages production of ID card. Figure #2, items 206,202 transmit request to the decisioning system)

Jaros does not expressly teach the limitation comprising:

evaluating a rule set and placing the request into one of a card issuance component queue where cards are ready for immediate production and a production queue for later production based on the evaluation, wherein the rule set includes card type criteria and location criteria, and further comprising

However, in an analgous application relating to the production of identification cards, Lenz at (Paras. 27-28) teaches the evaluation of a rule set based on the type of card being produced, as well as the location of other client devices on the network. Specifically, these paragraphs describe a number of factors in the rule set including client identifying (location) information, time remaining to completion, and others. The passages also cite the spooling capabilities by the central server, and the ability by the server to route card issuance requests. Spooling is equivalent to queuing as explained by the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 3rd edition, 1997 which defines the verb "spool" as "to store a data document in a queue..." Of course, in the instant application as well as in Lenz, the "documents" are actually identification cards.

It would have therefore been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made, to combine the teachings of Jaros, relating to a method for receiving and transmitting identification card production requests, with the teachings of Lenz, relating to evaluation of a rule set for determining whether to place a card production request in a production queue or route it for instant issuance. The motivation for such a combination is within the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and is simply to enhance customer satisfaction in the use of the system in that a customer can be informed if his card will be produced at a later time and place, which in turn gives the customer more options, in that if the production of the card is queued, he can plan on retrieving it at a later time.

Continuing, Jaros teaches the limitation comprising:

linking said request, based at least in part on the requested card type and a location where the request originated, to one of the card issuance component queue and the

production queue; and (Col. 5, lines 34-42, describing the embossing record created by the server, and transmitted to the remote dispenser)

forwarding said request from said card issuance component queue to a card issuance controller process coupled to the a plurality of card issuance machines for production of the identification card; and producing the identification card using one of the card issuance machines. (Col. 5, line 54 – Col. 6, line 4; Col. 10, lines 13-16)

With regard to Claim 14, Jaros does not expressly teach the method comprising:

receiving instruction from an administrative user to process requests in said production queue; and transferring said request from said production queue to said card issuance component queue.

However, Lenz teaches this limitation at (Paras. 24,27-28; Figure 1, items 40,44). These paragraphs establish that web server is administering the production of the identification cards and a user has access to a web page for operating the server. Further it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made, to combine the teachings of Jaros, relating to a method for receiving and transmitting identification card requests, with the teachings of Lenz, relating to receiving instruction from an administrative user to process requests in said queues. The motivation for such a combination is within the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and is to be able to troubleshoot production, timing, and other issues by providing the ability of a user to intervene. That is to say, an automated system can direct the card production traffic, but by providing for an administrative user, the system allows for much more flexibility by allowing the user to account for a number of different preferences and scenarios that are difficult to automate, such a where a person ordering a card might physically be located at one time or another.

With regard to Claim 17, Jaros teaches the method comprising:

transmitting a request from a client computer system to an enterprise server system, wherein the request is to produce an identification card of a certain type;
(Col. 9, lines 25-39, describing the request by the user for a card, secured or otherwise, and Figure #2, items 206,202, which accepts requests and can transmits information a central server)

Jaros does not expressly contemplate:

at the enterprise server system, evaluating the request, including the card type and a location where the request originated, to determine where and when the request to produce the identification card can be fulfilled, wherein the determination further includes evaluating where card issuance machines are located and available for producing the identification card;

However, Lenz at (Paras. 27-28) does teach the evaluation of a request for production of an identification card. Specifically, these paragraphs describe a number of factors in the rule set including client identifying (location) information, time remaining to completion, number of already printed cards, number of cards remaining to be printed and others. In addition with regard to the following limitation,

if the evaluation indicates that the card is not ready for immediate production, placing the request into a production type queue for later processing; and

Lenz also teaches production queuing in that (Paras. 27-28) also cite the spooling capabilities by the central server, and the ability by the server to route card issuance requests. Spooling is equivalent to queuing as explained by the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 3rd edition, 1997 which defines the verb "spool" as "to store a data document in a queue..." Of course, in the instant application as well as in Lenz, the "documents" are actually identification cards.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made, to combine the teachings of Jaros, relating to a method for receiving and transmitting identification card production requests, with the teachings of Lenz, relating to evaluation a production request for determining where and when to produce the card, as well as queuing of the production commands. The motivation for such a combination is within the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and is simply to enhance customer satisfaction in the use of the system in that a customer can be informed if his card will be produced at a later time and place, which in turn gives the customer more options, in that if the production of the card is queued, he can plan on retrieving it at a later time.

Jaros teaches the following limitations:

if the evaluation indicates that the card is ready for immediate production, placing the request into a card issuance type queue for immediate production of the card using one of the card issuance machines; and producing the card from the card issuance type queue or the production type queue using one of the card issuance machines.
(Col. 5, lines 34-42 and Col. 5, line 65 – Col. 6, line 4, describing the central server forwarding the requests for production to the remote dispensers for production, based on a collaboration of all the devices)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS NON-FINAL. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Alpert whose telephone number is (571) 272-6738. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammel, can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

James M. Alpert
July 17, 2006

ELLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER